



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,532	07/23/2003	Woo-Young Jang	249/394	6657

27849 7590 04/10/2007
LEE & MORSE, P.C.
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE
SUITE 500
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042

EXAMINER

APANIUS, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3736

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/10/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/624,532

Applicant(s)

JANG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Apanius

Art Unit

3736

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 would require at least further consideration because it would change the scope of the independent claim from that previously considered and result in a different combination of elements with respect to the dependent claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the combination of figures 4A and 7 show the subject matter of claim 13 and requests that the outstanding drawing objection be withdrawn. In response, it is noted that combination of two distance adjusters as set forth in claim 13 must be shown in a single drawing. Furthermore, it is noted that each figure 4A and 7 separately show a distance adjuster for the electrode configuration shown in figures 3A-3D. Each figure separately shows both measurement electrodes and current supply electrodes whereas the claims recite one adjuster for adjusting measurement electrodes and another adjuster for adjusting current supply electrodes. Furthermore, it is noted that none of the figures show two stationary screw lines separated from each other by a predetermined distance and perpendicular to each other. Therefore, the outstanding drawing objection is considered proper and is maintained.

Applicant requests that the outstanding 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection be withdrawn because the specification as originally filed, describe measurement of the accurate DC level of a signal. The Applicant further reasons that in order to accurately measure a DC level of a signal, the applied current must also be a DC current. In response, it is respectfully submitted that a DC level of a signal can be accurately measured even when the applied constant current is not a DC current. For example, a DC component of a signal can be accurately measured even when an AC current is applied. Therefore, the outstanding 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection is considered proper and is maintained.

Applicant further argues that an allegation of new matter in a claim to support a written description rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is improper because a written description requirement issue generally involves the question of whether the subject matter of a claim is supported by the disclosure of an application as filed. In response, it is respectfully noted that the new matter discussed in the rejection is explicitly and clearly related to a lack of support for claimed subject matter in the original disclosure. The rejection is considered proper.

Matthew H. O'Leary
MATTHEW H. O'LEARY
PATENT EXAMINER
CENTER 3700